Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the pills contained quinine, aloes, iron sulphate, hydrastis, ginger, and cornstarch.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements appearing in the said boxes, wrappers, booklets, and circulars were false and fraudulent in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects set forth in the said statements.

On November 2, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10263. Adulteration of condensed milk. U. S. * * * v. 5 Barrels and 4 Barrels * * * of * * * Condensed Milk. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 13751, 13752. I. S. Nos. 5-t, 6-t. S. Nos. C-2532. C-2533.)

On October 4, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 9 barrels of condensed milk, at South Bend, Ind., alleging that a part of the article had been invoiced by Brown, Young & Co., Weehawken, N. J. (also of New York, N. Y.), and shipped by the J. Lowe Co., Waverly Transfer, N. J., and that the remainder thereof had been shipped by Brown, Young & Co., Weehawken, N. J., on or about July 2 and 29, 1920, respectively, and transported from the State of New Jersey into the State of Indiana, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. Both consignments of the article were invoiced, "Five Barrels Holland Condensed Milk * * * "

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal or vegetable substance.

On December 23, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10264. Adulteration and misbranding of Sako sweetener. U. S. * * * v. 24 Bottles * * * of * * * Sako. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 13849. I. S. No. 24606-r. S. No. C-2574.)

On November 12, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 24 bottles of Sako, at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by the A-One Products Co., Chicago, Ill., July 7, 1920, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Sako * * * Bottle herein contains two liquid ounces which approximately equals the sweetening power of 15 pounds of sugar. This gives you the corresponding sweetness of sugar at a relative cost of approximately 6 2/3¢ per pound. * * * Guaranteed to comply with the Federal Food and Drugs Act by Sako Products Company, Chicago, Ill. * * * "

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it contained an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, to wit, saccharin, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that the above-quoted statements contained on the labels of the bottles containing the said article were false and misleading and the said article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead purchasers by representing it to be of sucrose origin, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On March 8, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.